UNITED
NATIONS

CERD

International Convention on
the Elimination
of all Forms of
Racial Discrimination

Distr.
GENERAL

CERD/C/SR.1234
12 December 1997

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Fifty-first session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1234th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 15 August 1997, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. BANTON

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (continued)

PREVENTION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, INCLUDING EARLY WARNING AND URGENT PROCEDURES (continued)

Bosnia and Herzegovina (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.97-17916 (E)

ACTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FIFTY-FIRST SESSION:

(b) Effective implementation of international instruments on human rights

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights the report of an independent expert, Philip Alston, on the effective functioning of bodies established pursuant to United Nations human rights instruments

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Draft concluding observations concerning the eleventh periodic report of Mexico

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to a note before them (CERD/C/51/Misc.33) on the march planned in Roskilde, Denmark, in memory of Rudolph Hess.

2. Mr. ABOUL-NASR, supported by Mr. Garvalov and Mr. Rechetov, said the Committee had better things to do than to fuel the debate on Nazism when so many massacres had occurred without the international community paying much attention.

3. Mr. WOLFRUM said that it was he, as country rapporteur for Denmark, who had asked for the note to be distributed, as the march was being planned by an organization which was known for its neo-Nazi activities and which should clearly be prohibited under article 4 (b) of the Convention. That having been said, the Committee still had the option of expressing its opinion after the event.

4. The CHAIRMAN said he took it the Committee did not wish to express an opinion on the matter.

5. It was so decided.

PREVENTION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, INCLUDING EARLY WARNING AND URGENT PROCEDURES (agenda item 4) (continued)

Bosnia and Herzegovina (CERD/C/247 and Add.1) (continued)

6. Mr. AHMADU said that the cases which should be considered under an urgent procedure should take up at least as much of the Committee's time as the consideration of periodic reports and should even take precedence over the latter. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Dayton Agreement was clearly not being applied as it should be, and Mr. Holbrooke was continually having to remind the parties of their commitments under the Agreement. If nothing was done, it would become impossible to keep track of the persons who should be brought to trial and the Agreement would become a dead letter. The Committee should make a statement, even if only symbolic. At least it would be read and would show how seriously the Committee viewed the situation.

7. In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Committee should also at least talk to Mrs. Rehn, Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, about the human rights situation in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, and in any case should hold discussions with representatives of the countries covered by urgent procedures. The States had to be convinced that the Committee wished only to improve its understanding of the situation in their country, in order to help them overcome their problems.

8. The CHAIRMAN said that most of the members shared Mr. Ahmadu's opinion and recalled that the Committee had decided to give greater priority to the

consideration of prevention measures than to its examination of over overdue reports. The Committee should ask the country rapporteur for Bosnia and Herzegovina to prepare a draft decision for the Committee to consider in a week's time.

9. It was so decided.

ACTION BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FIFTY-FIRST SESSION:

(b) Effective implementation of international instruments on human rights

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting to the Commission on Human Rights the report of an independent expert, Philip Alston, on the effective functioning of bodies established pursuant to United Nations human rights instruments (E/CN.4/1997/74)

10. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to Commission on Human Rights decision 1997/105, by which it invited the Secretary-General to solicit the views of the relevant bodies on Mr. Alston's report.

11. Mr. GARVALOV said that the Committee was duty bound to reply to that request, especially as it had virtually been accused by Mr. Alston of refusing to discuss the proposals he had been making for almost eight years. Although the report undeniably had some constructive aspects, his attention had been caught in particular by the author's arguments that the treaty system was "unsustainable", as stated in paragraphs 10 and 12. Mr. Alston placed much of the blame for the system's malfunctioning on the treaty bodies themselves, rather than on the States parties or the United Nations. Mr. Alston also based himself on the objective of universal ratification of the Covenants and Conventions to suggest, on the one hand, that if that objective was not achieved, the fault would lie with the treaty bodies, and on the other hand, that if one day it was realized those bodies would never manage to keep up with the staggering number of reports to be considered, so that their conclusions and recommendations would be outdated and useless.

12. The treaty bodies' responsibilities lay in an objective and timely consideration of State party reports, promoting a constructive dialogue with States parties and coming up with effective, constructive conclusions and follow-up action. He wondered in what way the treaty bodies had not been performing their duties: had they not already become more efficient by improving their methods of work? Had they not spurred some States parties into amending some of their laws and practices? Had they not aroused public interest in human rights and come up with procedures for considering urgent cases and ensuring prevention? Why then give up the collective wisdom of the treaty bodies in favour of a one-man monitoring mechanism?

13. It was surprising that Mr. Alston had failed to analyse the real situation of the treaty bodies. They were actually unable to develop their potential to the fullest extent. They had too few meetings; their reports were not given the consideration they deserved; cooperation between them was almost non-existent and two of them were more favoured than the others in terms of secretariat services, working groups, pre-sessional meetings, number

of meetings and sessions and so forth. Their own Committee, did not have enough time, especially to consider the follow-up given to its conclusions, but it nonetheless managed to complete its workload during its two three-week sessions. Pages 97-103 of its 1996 report contained a description of its working methods. Unfortunately, Mr. Alston had based his report on the study of two treaty bodies, the Human Rights Committee and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had never been consulted, despite the fact that the author was calling for a substantial exchange of views.

14. The treaty bodies were doing everything possible to encourage States parties to publicize the reports they submitted to those bodies, to make human rights a priority objective of the United Nations, to examine in depth the human rights situation in States parties - in short, to respond to the appeal made by the Secretary-General and the World Conference on Human Rights. Instead of limiting the number of committees, as suggested by Mr. Alston in paragraph 94, they should be given the means to be effective. To that end, the United Nations and States parties should study the problem of compliance and find ways to resolve it; the United Nations should grant all the treaty bodies the necessary resources to develop their potential on an equal footing; the treaty bodies should rationalize their working methods, consider reports thoroughly and objectively, draft concluding observations with specific requests, outline follow-up procedures, etc.; the United Nations should organize a conference for the treaty bodies; their annual reports, and in particular their decisions on early warning and urgent cases, should be transmitted directly to the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Secretary-General; the pertinent treaties should be amended or other means developed to permit States parties to submit a consolidated report, divided into as many chapters as there were bodies, with each chapter to be considered by the relevant body; lastly coordination and consultation among the human rights bodies within the United Nations system should be institutionalized.

15. Mr. WOLFRUM said that, given the importance of Mr. Alston's report for any possible reform of the treaty body system, the Committee should express its views on the subject and in particular challenge the erroneous interpretation of the situation used by the author as his basis for asserting that the system was unsustainable. According to paragraphs 37 and 48 of the report, the Committee was expecting 401 overdue reports and would have to spend three years on their consideration if they were submitted. In fact, Mr. Alston had never tried to find out how the Committee worked; when it studied the situation in a country, it often considered several reports at once and rarely allowed more than six months to elapse between the receipt of a report and its consideration. If the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women considered the reports submitted to it on average three years after receiving them, as stated in paragraph 51, it was simply because that body met even less frequently than the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

16. He recognized that certain reforms were necessary, but suggested that they should not be instituted until after the extent, cause and frequency of the delays mentioned by Mr. Alston had been determined. Furthermore, reforms

should be pertinent; for example, precious time should not be wasted trying to promote universal ratification of human rights instruments, which was not the treaty bodies' responsibility.

17. Any reform of the treaty bodies should also take account of what the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and the Commission on Human Rights did or could do. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in particular should not restrict its scope by focusing its action on individual questions. The Convention was already specific enough in itself, and the Committee should always have the flexibility to consider situations that sometimes developed very rapidly. The only shift of emphasis which he thought worthwhile might perhaps apply to the concluding observations, which could be more specific and aid in evaluating the situation described in subsequent reports of the States concerned.

18. He was not in favour of setting up pre-sessional working groups for the Committee, as, unlike the Human Rights Committee, it was composed not of jurists who dealt exclusively with legal matters and were therefore "interchangeable", but rather of experts drawn from many backgrounds, which was a major asset in combating racial discrimination. He was opposed to the idea of limiting the reports of States parties to 50 pages, as suggested in paragraph 53, considering that the Committee had never complained of the length of a report; furthermore, if the information provided by the Government was too brief, the Committee had to turn to information provided by the print media, television or non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which the Committee preferred to avoid.

19. Unlike the author of the report, he thought that the early warning and urgent procedures should be maintained, provided that the preparatory activities, in particular the system of documentation, were streamlined. He was prepared to admit that asking States parties to prepare comprehensive reports would have the advantage of enabling the Committee to find information on the implementation of other conventions and on the work of other treaty bodies in one and the same document. Similarly, the suggestion that the Committee's concluding observations on periodic reports should be clearer and more specific should obviously be endorsed, as should the idea of the Committee allowing States parties to express their own views on those observations and that of inviting the Third Committee (social, humanitarian and cultural) to communicate its observations in order to ensure a continuing dialogue.

20. The Committee should try to avoid overlapping with the activities of other bodies established pursuant to international human rights instruments, particularly those of the Sub-Commission. In that respect, the division of labour among treaty bodies should be improved. The planned reform of the system should not only cover human rights treaty bodies, as recommended by Mr. Alston, but should also take account of the fact that those bodies had the same objectives and should combine and coordinate their efforts. At the practical level, the documentation and library services made available to the Committee should be improved.

21. Mr. van BOVEN said the Committee should not reject en bloc all the proposals made by Mr. Alston in his capacity as an independent expert, but

should examine them with an open mind. As to short- and medium-term measures, he was willing to consider the ideas put forward by other members of the Committee. For example, the Committee could advise States parties in advance of the main questions it was going to ask them at the meeting on the periodic reports, as other committees did. Furthermore, States parties should be able to comment on the Committee's concluding observations and, as suggested by Mr. Alston, those observations should be made clearer and more specific. Early warning procedures, which left a lot to be desired owing to inadequate preparation and follow-up, should also be improved.

22. As to long-term measures, the Committee should study the solutions proposed by Mr. Alston, not solely from its own viewpoint, but from all angles, and also take into consideration the concerns and needs of States parties, bearing in mind that, even in the best of cases, States parties succeeded in fulfilling their reporting obligations on time only with difficulty. Unlike the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations did not have a unified system for monitoring the implementation of conventions prepared under its auspices. That considerably complicated the task of the States parties, which had to submit reports to different human rights treaty bodies. The idea of consolidating reports into a single document was therefore worth pursuing. The Committee had already improved its functioning in certain respects, but there was nothing to stop it from creating one or two mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of human rights conventions. Introducing the reforms proposed by Mr. Alston, particularly in paragraph 120 of his report, would necessarily be a lengthy process, which should be undertaken in a constructive and broad-minded spirit.

23. Mrs. ZOU said that in his report, Mr. Alston presented constructive and interesting proposals that deserved close consideration. The idea of asking States parties to prepare comprehensive reports had several advantages, in particular that of considerably simplifying the task of States parties and eliminating overlaps. On the other hand, the proposal to merge the work of the human rights treaty bodies was much less convincing: that would raise a number of practical, almost insoluble problems. Dialogue with States parties would be virtually precluded. If the single-report solution was adopted, at the very least State party reports would have to be studied separately by the Committees with regard to their respective areas of concern. There would be other major problems, such as the different frequencies of the reports submitted by States parties to the different committees, and the need to coordinate the activities of delegations attending meetings which were considering country reports.

24. Mr. VALENCIA RODRÍGUEZ said that the Committee, which had been established under the Convention, was entitled to organize its work as it wished on the basis of the provisions of the Charter and of the basic human rights instruments, in the light of its essential mission, which was to ensure the universal implementation of the Convention subject to respecting the sovereignty of States parties.

25. In view of the constant growth of its workload as a result of the increasing number of States parties to the Convention and the proliferation of issues it was handling, the Committee should take steps to improve its functioning. It should in particular restrict its activities to the areas

defined in the Convention and refrain from dealing with those that came under other treaty bodies. In preparing its annual reports, it should allow its members enough time to submit their comments to the rapporteurs, and ensure that its concluding observations were concise and to the point and reflected positions adopted by consensus. In order to ensure that all reports were considered, the total duration of the Committee's two annual sessions could be extended to six or seven weeks, or a pre-sessional one-week meeting could be added, during which five Committee members would prepare the main questions to put to the States parties, with the assistance of the rapporteurs.

26. As far as self-discipline was concerned, the Committee should limit the speaking time of rapporteurs to 30 minutes and that of other members to 10 minutes. It could be suggested that States parties limit their periodic reports to 50 pages and prepare comprehensive reports in which a special chapter would deal with implementation of the Convention. Annual coordination and consultation meetings should also continue to be held with the chairpersons of the treaty bodies, particularly in order to eliminate any overlaps between them.

27. Mr. DIACONU said that in its comment the Committee should at the outset state that it had studied Mr. Alston's report from different standpoints and with an open mind, guided by the need to ensure increasingly complete and universal implementation of the Convention. It should try to present its points of view clearly and forcefully, given the important impact that forthcoming decisions would be certain to have on its activities. The Committee should stress that activities relating to its principal mission were being carried out in a normal fashion, that it was not in a critical state and that the various aspects of consideration of State party periodic reports were being constantly improved. It should energetically deny the assertion that it was expecting 400 reports and recall that the longest delays in that respect were considerably less than the independent expert claimed.

28. The number of meetings, currently set at 60 per year, seemed sufficient. Although the reports, even those of federal States, rarely exceeded 50 pages, the idea of asking States parties to submit consolidated reports could be envisaged, so long as they included a core document on the implementation of human rights instruments as well as sections directed to the bodies concerned with specific questions, such as torture, women or children. With regard to urgent procedures, any overlaps with the work of other United Nations bodies should be eliminated. However, the proposal to set up a single committee responsible for considering the report of each State party was unacceptable, as it did not take account of the particular specialization and competence required of the different treaty bodies for considering the reports.

29. The Committee should adopt more specific recommendations and conclusions and should refrain from dealing with areas that came under other bodies. In its annual report, for each of the States considered it should combine the sections that dealt with principal subjects of concern and with suggestions and recommendations, in order to avoid repetition, and should do away with the introduction and the part dealing with positive aspects. A member of the secretariat could be instructed to monitor any overlap of activities between treaty bodies. The Chairman of the Committee could personally submit the Committee's annual report to the Third Committee and, prior to consideration

of the relevant periodic report, each country rapporteur could distribute a list of issues to take up, which would ease the task of States parties. It would also be useful for the States to be able to submit their own comments on the Committee's concluding observations concerning their periodic reports, so that they could appear in the Committee's annual report.

30. He supported Mr. Valencia Rodríguez' proposals on self-discipline at Committee meetings; in its draft the Committee should emphasize that it was making an effort to improve its working methods, simply in order to improve its efficiency.

31. Mr. SHERIFIS proposed asking the Chairman to draft a text setting forth the views of the Committee on Mr. Alston's report, for adoption by the Committee.

32. Mr. de GOUTTES said he was opposed neither to the idea of asking States parties to limit their reports to 50 pages nor to that of having them prepare a consolidated report for all the treaty bodies, so long as the section on implementation of the Convention was sufficiently developed. That method would lighten the workload for States submitting reports to several treaty bodies. Unlike Mr. Alston, however, he did not think that the urgent procedures could be considered practically useless.

33. With regard to the Committee's working languages, he was afraid that the proposals outlined by Mr. Alston would defeat the principle of linguistic diversity to which Member States remained committed and would institute real linguistic discrimination. Progress had been achieved by the Committee regarding the quality of the concluding observations or conclusions of the different treaty bodies. Nevertheless, the Committee should endeavour to refine its conclusions even more and allow States parties to comment on them. With regard to the procedure for consideration of reports, prior to consideration of a given report, the respective country rapporteur should discuss the issues he planned to address with the authorities of that country. Furthermore, the Committee should ask its questions more concisely, so as not to give delegations the impression that the Committee was limiting the time it allowed for their reply. The members should probably be content with raising points that had not been touched upon by the rapporteur.

34. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said the Committee was under no obligation whatsoever to issue a comment on Mr. Alston's report. That having been being said, the judicious remarks which had been made in the course of the meeting concerning the functioning of the Committee should be noted, on the understanding that any modification in Committee procedure should be in conformity with its rules of procedure. The Chairman should draft a text summing up the Committee's views on the report under study.

35. Mr. SHAHI agreed that in some respects the Committee could streamline its procedure for consideration of reports. He also supported the suggestion that periodic reports should be limited to 50 pages. On the other hand, he was strongly opposed to the idea of replacing the urgent procedures with a system whereby the representatives or experts of the Commission on Human Rights or some other body would deal with urgent situations, while the treaty bodies would focus mainly on State party reports. The urgent procedures

approach had been adopted precisely in order to prevent massive violations of human rights and because the special rapporteur procedure had proven ineffective in that respect, as those persons were not sent into the field until after the event, when the violations had already been committed. The Committee should reaffirm the need for the urgent procedures it had adopted. The idea of having a consolidated report prepared for all the treaty bodies was in his view unrealistic, given the specificity of the different international instruments concerned. He did not agree either with Mr. Alston that the current system for the submission of reports was not sustainable. That system could be improved, and it was up to each treaty body to determine to what extent it could reform its procedures in order to reduce the workload involved in the preparation of individual State reports. It might be pointed out that the Committee's action had been successful, since the number of States that had ratified the Convention had grown. The treaty bodies were in the best position to make recommendations on the implementation of the conventions which concerned them, and the idea of merging those bodies was not at all realistic. However, he agreed with Mr. Alston that the concluding observations should be even more specific.

36. Mr. AHMADU said that the Committee should endeavour to streamline its procedures for the consideration of reports. He was also of the opinion that the Chairman should prepare a document reflecting the Committee's views on Mr. Alston's report.

37. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished him to prepare two texts summing up the debate on Mr. Alston's report, one for members of the Committee, to be drafted with the help of the two Vice-Chairmen, and the other to be a revised version of the first text, which would be submitted to the meeting of persons chairing the treaty bodies in a month's time.

38. Mr. SHAHI suggested that Mr. de Gouttes should also join the drafting group in view of Mr. Alston's emphasis on "urgent procedures".

39. It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Draft concluding observations concerning the eleventh periodic report of Mexico (CERD/C/50/Misc.24, future CERD/C/304/Add.30) (continued)

Paragraph 4

40. Mr. de GOUTTES said that he would be presenting the amendments proposed by Committee members. In paragraph 4, Mr. Yutzis had proposed adding the phrase "mostly indigenous" after the word "population" on the fourth line. Mr. Shahi had suggested adding the word "entirely" to the last sentence, before "succeeded".

41. Paragraph 4 was adopted, as amended.

Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7

42. Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 were adopted.

Additional paragraph (new paragraph 8)

43. Mr. de GOUTTES said it had been suggested that the last two sentences of paragraph 2 should be made into a new paragraph following paragraph 7, which would then become paragraph 8. All the subsequent paragraphs would be renumbered.

44. It was so decided.

Paragraph 8 (new paragraph 9)

45. Mr. de GOUTTES at Mr. Diaconu's suggestion, proposed amending the second sentence of the paragraph to read: ", sometimes involving public authorities,".

46. Paragraph 8 (new paragraph 9) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 9 (new paragraph 10)

47. Paragraph 9 (new paragraph 10) was adopted.

Paragraph 10 (new paragraph 11)

48. Mr. de GOUTTES said that Mr. Valencia Rodríguez proposed deleting the phrase "the Committee notes with concern that", so that the paragraph would read: "With regard to article 5 of the Convention, in certain situations, an individual's right to enjoy equal treatment in the courts is not effectively guaranteed ...".

49. Paragraph 10 (new paragraph 11) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 11 (new paragraph 12)

50. Mr. de GOUTTES proposed amending the paragraph to read: "Concern was expressed concerning the right to security of person of indigenous inhabitants and illegal immigrants. This right to security of person has in certain cases been violated by representatives of the forces of law and order, paramilitary groups and landowners. All too often those responsible for these crimes have gone unpunished."

51. Paragraph 11 (new paragraph 12) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 12 (new paragraph 13)

52. Mr. ABOUL-NASR wondered whether "civil" rights had been deliberately omitted in paragraph 12, which dealt with political rights, considering that economic, social and cultural rights were mentioned in paragraph 13.

53. Mr. de GOUTTES said that civil rights were not mentioned in paragraph 12 because the Committee had not been informed of any violations of those rights.

54. Paragraph 12 (new paragraph 13) was adopted.

Paragraph 13 (new paragraph 14)

55. Mr. de GOUTTES said that Mr. Valencia Rodríguez proposed amending the first sentence of the paragraph to read: "With respect to the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, the Committee notes with concern that persons from indigenous groups live in extreme poverty."

56. Mr. SHERIFIS proposed replacing the phrase "the Committee notes with concern" with "it is noted with concern".

57. Paragraph 13 (new paragraph 14) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 (new paragraphs 15, 16 and 17)

58. Paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 (new paragraphs 15, 16 and 17) were adopted.

Paragraph 17 (new paragraph 18)

59. Mr. de GOUTTES said that Mr. Valencia Rodríguez proposed amending the paragraph to read: "The fact that the report of the State party contains no accurate statistics on the indigenous population makes it difficult to analyse the work done on the rights recognized by the Convention for this large segment of the population."

60. Mr. GARVALOV proposed replacing "recognized by" with "listed in".

61. Mr. de GOUTTES suggested that "reconnus par" should then be replaced in the French version with "énoncés dans".

62. Paragraph 17 (new paragraph 18) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 18 (new paragraph 19)

63. Mr. de GOUTTES proposed replacing the word "lastly" at the beginning of the paragraph with the word "finally" in the English version.

64. Paragraph 18 (new paragraph 19) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 19 (new paragraph 20)

65. Mr. de GOUTTES said that the Chairman and Mr. Diaconu proposed amending the paragraph to read: "The State party is requested to furnish, in its next report, detailed information on the situation of the various indigenous groups living in Mexico."

66. Paragraph 19 (new paragraph 20) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 20 (new paragraph 21)

67. Mr. de GOUTTES said that Mr. Valencia Rodríguez proposed deleting the words "sean más eficaces" at the end of the first sentence in the Spanish version.

68. The CHAIRMAN suggested adding the words "members of" before "all groups of the population" at the beginning of the third line of the English text. He also proposed deleting the word "should" in the fifth line and replacing the words "those targeting" with "among" in the penultimate line.

69. Paragraph 20 (new paragraph 21) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 21 (new paragraph 22)

70. Mr. YUTZIS proposed amending the second line of the paragraph to read: "... information containing precise indicators on ...".

71. Paragraph 21 (new paragraph 22) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 22 (new paragraph 23)

72. The CHAIRMAN suggested deleting the word "should" from the first line of the English text.

73. Mr. de GOUTTES, at Mr. Diaconu's suggestion, proposed dividing the paragraph into two, with the second sentence becoming a separate paragraph.

74. It was so decided.

75. Paragraph 22 (new paragraph 23), as amended, and the additional paragraph were adopted.

Paragraph 23 (new paragraph 25)

76. The CHAIRMAN proposed deleting the word "should" from the first line of the English text.

77. Paragraph 23 (new paragraph 25) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 24 (new paragraph 26)

78. The CHAIRMAN proposed again deleting the word "should" from the first line.

79. Mr. de GOUTTES proposed replacing the words "de tels crimes" with "de telles infractions" in the fifth line of the French text.

80. Paragraph 24 (new paragraph 26) was adopted, as amended.

Paragraph 25 (new paragraph 27)

81. The CHAIRMAN proposed once more deleting the word "should" from the first line.

82. Mr. ABOUL-NASR questioned the need to refer to "large" landowners.

83. Mr. YUTZIS said that in Latin America, that expression could designate subjects of law which were not necessarily corporations. It might therefore be more appropriate to refer to large landowners and large real estate companies.

84. The CHAIRMAN proposed continuing consideration of paragraph 25 (new paragraph 27) at a subsequent meeting.

85. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.